

Appl. No. 09/925,833  
Amdt. Dated December 23, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of November 2, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 81752.0110  
Customer No. 26021

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application. Claims 1-24 are submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the prior art in their present form, for the reasons set forth below. No new matter is involved.

In paragraph I. which begins on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 5-13 and 17-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,677,999 of Hidaka et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,115,024 of Hayama. In Paragraph II. which begins on page 6 of the Office Action, claims 2-4 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hidaka '999 in view of Hayama '024 and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,510,992 of Kara. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In Applicant's prior Response To Office Action of August 3, 2005, arguments are set forth on pages 11 and 12 thereof as to why the claims are submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the cited art. On page 2 and at the top of page 3 of the final Office Action of November 2, 2005, the Examiner sets forth a Response to Arguments. Applicant has carefully reviewed the Examiner's Response to Arguments and believes that such arguments are not well taken, for the following reasons.

In the "Response to Arguments" on pages 2 and 3 of the final Office Action, there are numerous references to specific portions of Hayama. Such references include "these fixed formats can be viewed in the display mode ..." lines 4 and 5 of the large paragraph on page 2, "the displayed image can be a print preview" (line 9 of that paragraph), "Figs. 8 and 9 ...they are divided into lines of blocks" at lines 11-13 of the paragraph, "in Fig. 7, items T10 and T11... large and medium-sized are two types of address labels that can be printed" (lines 1 and 2 of the paragraph at

the bottom of page 2, and "The examples are based upon the types of address labels as seen in Fig. 11" in the last 2 lines of the large paragraph on page 2.

Nevertheless, these specific disclosures in Hayama have nothing to do with the feature of the present invention in which the item images are grouped into  $m$  blocks...and printing is made of the  $k$  blocks on a block-by-block basis, as recited, for example, at lines 12-16 of claim 1.

By the same token, Fig. 9 of Hayama shows how to change the zoom, as described at lines 66 of col. 13 through line 5 of col. 14 of that reference. Further, the relationship between Figs. 8A and 9C is described at lines 2-14 of col. 13. Namely, the display image data G11c, which is formed by using dummy data, is shown as in Fig. 9C so that the user can recognize the print image data.

Nowhere in Hayama are there disclosures of the advantages of the present invention as described in the last four lines of page 4 to the last line of the specification. More specifically, and in accordance with the present invention, the feature of "grouping the item images into  $m$  blocks based on the address information (lines 12 and 13 of claim 1) makes it possible to print an address printable on a tape having a first tape width also on a tape having a second tape width (page 5, last four lines).

Hayama neither discloses nor suggests such a feature.

On the other hand, the primary reference Hidaka discloses printing in a tape with a fixed format, as described at lines 8 and 9 of col. 9 thereof. Fig. 12 of that reference shows nothing but different sizes of printed tape. There is no disclosure of grouping the item images into blocks, as set forth in claim 1 of the present invention. Claims 1-24 are submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the cited art in their present form.

Appl. No. 09/925,833  
Amdt. Dated December 23, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of November 2, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 81752.0110  
Customer No. 26021


In conclusion, claims 1-24 are believed to clearly distinguish patentably over the prior art for the reasons set forth above. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: December 23, 2005

By:   
John P. Scherlacher  
Registration No. 23,009  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Phone: 213-337-6700  
Fax: 213-337-6701